



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of	)	
Stephane Rayon et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 2876
Application No.: 09/601,111	)	Examiner: Ahshik Kim
Filed: July 27, 2000	)	Confirmation No.: 5591
For: MICROPROCESSOR CARD	)	
INCLUDING A CABLE	)	
COMMUNICATION CIRCUIT	)	

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 6, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6-8. The continued indication that claims 2-5 contain allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation.

The Examiner is thanked for the courteous interview conducted with Applicants' undersigned representative. The substance of that interview is reflected in the following remarks.

Claim 2 was objected to on the grounds that it contains multiple recitations of "a circuit." The Office Action suggests that the modifiers "first," "second," etc. be used if they are different circuits. It is respectfully submitted that, whether the various circuits are considered to be different circuits, or a single comprehensive circuit, or some combination of the two, is a design implementation that is not pertinent to the claimed concept. The important feature is that a circuit be present which performs each of the operations recited in the claim. It does not matter

whether those operations are performed by a single circuit, or multiple respective circuits. Thus, to the extent that the use of the suggested modifiers could be interpreted to mean that the various claimed circuits are physically distinct from one another, that would constitute an unnecessary narrowing of the scope of the claim. It is respectfully submitted that the claim is clear, since each circuit is defined in terms of the operation that it performs. A person of ordinary skill in the art can readily determine the subject matter being claimed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, on the grounds that they were considered to be anticipated by the Yamaguchi patent (U.S. 5,365,047). As pointed out in Applicants' previous response, it is respectfully submitted that the Yamaguchi patent does not anticipate the claimed subject matter, since it does not disclose a hard-wired circuit disposed between a microprocessor and contacts on a card.

In response to the previous arguments, the most recent Office Action questions where the hard-wired circuit is disclosed in the application, and suggested that Applicants point out, in the drawing, what constitutes the hard-wired circuit.

As discussed during the above-noted interview, the specification discloses that one of the distinguishing features of the invention resides in the fact that communications between a terminal and a microprocessor card take place by means of a communication device. This device is in the form of a hard-wired circuit. See page 2, lines 17-21. In the drawings, this communication device, i.e., the hard-wired circuit, is represented by the reference numeral 40. See page 4, lines 23-26. As illustrated in Figure 1, this communication device is disposed between the contact

terminals 22 of the card 30, and the microprocessor 10 of the card. In other words, the hard-wired communication device 40 is distinct from the microprocessor 10.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action takes the position that the UART 7a of the Yamaguchi patent is a hard-wired circuit. Whether or not the UART is a hard-wired circuit is not the point of contention. Rather, the distinguishing feature of the invention resides in the fact that the hard-wired circuit is disposed between the contacts and the microprocessor. As described in the specification, and noted in Applicants' previous responses, by arranging the communications device in this manner, the burden of analyzing the electrical signals transmitted between the card and the terminal, and the memory associated with this function, is off-loaded from the microprocessor itself.

It is respectfully submitted that the Yamaguchi patent does not disclose that the UART 7a is disposed between the contacts of the IC card and the microprocessor in a manner that would accomplish this same result. Rather, the UART constitutes part of the microprocessor. Specifically, as disclosed at column 2, lines 8-10, "the microcomputer 20 includes functions corresponding to the CPU 1, the ROM 4, the RAM 6 and the input/output circuit 7 . . . ." In the embodiment of Figure 1, the UART 7a constitutes the input/output circuit.

During the course of the interview, the Examiner noted that, in Figure 1, the UART 7a is illustrated as a separate block that is disposed between the CPU 1a and the contact P5. It is respectfully submitted, however, that this illustration does not disclose a hard-wired circuit disposed between the microcomputer and the contact. Rather, as stated at column 4, lines 20-24, Figure 1 illustrates the IC card 100a "in

the form of functionally separated blocks." Thus, the block 7a represents a *function* that is performed by the card. It does not represent a distinct hard-wired circuit.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that the CPU, per se, does not constitute the microcomputer. Rather, as indicated by the first quote above, the microcomputer includes not only the CPU, but also the ROM 4, the RAM 6 and the input/output circuit 7. This is consistent with Applicants' disclosure, in which the microprocessor 10 includes, in addition to the CPU 12, the RAM 14 and two memories 16, 18. The difference lies in the fact that, in the Yamaguchi patent, the input/output circuit 7, e.g., the UART 7a, is also part of the microcomputer, whereas in the claimed invention, it is a distinct hard-wired circuit that is disposed between the microprocessor and the contacts.

For the foregoing reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Yamaguchi patent does not anticipate the subject matter recited in claim 1, or dependent claims 6-8. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: October 6, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_



James A. LaBarre

Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620